

Communication from Public

Name: Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers - OPPOSE

Date Submitted: 06/20/2022 02:52 PM

Council File No: 22-1100-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Mayor Eric Garcetti and City Council Members, The California Hospitality United Coalition is a broad coalition fighting to protect our hospitality economy and jobs. We are writing to express our opposition to the “Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers” ordinance and urge you to not adopt it outright and rather give voters a say on this important issue. Please see the attached letter below.

CALIFORNIA HOSPITALITY UNITED COALITION



Strengthening the Voice of Business



CALIFORNIA
HISPANIC
CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE



Hotel Association
of Los Angeles



CALIFORNIA
BUSINESS
ROUNDTABLE



CALIFORNIA
RESTAURANT
ASSOCIATION



南加州台灣旅館業同業公會
TAIWAN HOTEL & MOTEL ASSOCIATION
OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



CALIFORNIA
TRAVEL
ASSOCIATION
Tourism's United Voice



CENTURYCITY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE



UNITED LATINOS
Promoviendo Acción Cívica

June 20, 2022

To: Honorable Mayor Eric Garcetti and City Council Members

Fr: California Hospitality United Coalition

Re: Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers -
OPPOSE

The California Hospitality United Coalition is a broad coalition fighting to protect our hospitality economy and jobs - representing social justice organizations, small businesses, and minority chambers of commerce among others. We are writing to express our opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance and urge you to not adopt it outright and rather give voters a say on this important issue.

We all want to protect hotel workers, but that is not what this ordinance is about. The workforce limitations and requirements to provide daily room cleaning would kill hotel green programs and impose room cleaning on guests who don't want it, while eliminating overtime opportunities for housekeepers who rely on the extra income to provide for their families.

Additionally, this proposal has not been evaluated for long-term economic impacts to the Transient Occupancy Tax, and thus, City General Funds. In Long Beach, where a similar measure was passed, there was a dramatic decrease in their TOT revenue following implementation. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are still recovering from the pandemic and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and result in less tax revenue.

Lastly, we are in a water crisis. Now is not the time for the city council to increase water usage in hotels for visitors when Angelenos are being asked to cut their own daily water usage by 35 percent because of the severe drought.

Again, we urge you to give Angelenos the opportunity to vote on this important ordinance.

Sincerely,

Lynn S. Mohrfeld, CAE
President & CEO
California Hotel & Lodging Association

The California Hospitality United Coalition:

California Hotel & Lodging Association
Central City Association of Los Angeles
Century City Chamber of Commerce
Greater Los Angeles Hospitality Association
Hotel Association of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles County Business Federation
Taiwan Hotel & Motel Association of Southern California
San Pedro Chamber of Commerce
Valley Industry & Commerce Association
Westside Council of Chambers of Commerce
California Business Roundtable
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
California Restaurant Association
California Retailers Association
California Travel Association
Antelope Valley Chambers of Commerce
American Hotel & Lodging Association
Asian American Hotel Owners Association
Asian Industry B2B
Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce
Burbank Chamber of Commerce
Brea Chamber of Commerce
California Association of Boutique & Breakfast Inns
California Business and Industrial Alliance
California Business Properties Association
California Delta Chambers & Visitors Bureau
California Taxpayers Coalition
California Taxpayer Protection Committee
Costa Mesa Chamber of Commerce
Destination Irvine
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce
El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce
Garden Grove Chamber of Commerce
Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce
Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce
Hispanic Chambers of Commerce San Francisco
Hotel Council of San Francisco
Inland Empire Economic Partnership
Inland Empire Regional Chamber of Commerce
La Canada Flintridge Chamber of Commerce
Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce

Malibu Chamber of Commerce
National Federation of Independent Business
Oceanside Chamber of Commerce
Petaluma Area Chamber of Commerce
Pomona Chamber of Commerce
Protect Culver City
R Street Sacramento Partnership
Rancho Mirage Chamber of Commerce
Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce
Regional Chamber of Commerce San Gabriel Valley
Regional Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Filipino American Chamber of Commerce
South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce
South Orange County Economic Coalition
Travel Santa Ana
Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce
United Latinos Action
West Ventura County Business Alliance
West Hollywood Chamber of Commerce
Visit Greater Palm Springs
Yorba Linda Chamber Of Commerce

Communication from Public

Name: Hotel Association of Los Angeles & Local Hotel Community

Date Submitted: 06/20/2022 05:24 PM

Council File No: 22-1100-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council Members: We are writing to express strong opposition to the “Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers” ordinance. We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide – Send it to the ballot. We oppose the measure for the following reasons: This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons. This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small “mom and pop” businesses — making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family. This measure would reduce the City’s vital TOT revenue The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City’s General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles’s hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry’s ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services. Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide – Send it to the ballot. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 17, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **David Hersch** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson to Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 17, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 17, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 17, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 17, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 17, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 17, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 17, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Sven Johansson** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 17, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **David Hersch** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kian Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **David Hersch** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Josh Maldonado** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **David Hersch** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rodolfo Gutierrez** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **David Hersch** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Andrea Knowles** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **David Hersch** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Gazi Shahjahan** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bharat Bhakta** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee to Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee to Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee to Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee to Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee to Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michael Dee** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mary Banzon** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar to Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Steven Dodar** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Bronte' Nersessian** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Grant Coonley** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup to Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **mark goldrup** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **veronica Rosales** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Maria De Miranda** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Silva** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Ermias Mekuria** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Rajesh Patel** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Irma Saguache** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Council Member Herb Wesson*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Council Member Gilbert Cedillo*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Liz Saldivar*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Hannah Lee*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Chad Molnar*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Rachel Brashier*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Solomon Rivera*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Lisa Hansen*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Karo Torossian*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Debby Kim*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Jennifer Barraza*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Council Member Curren Price*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Council Member Kevin de Leon*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Council Member Nithya Raman*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Council Member John Lee*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Council Member Paul Krekorian*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Council Member Mitch O'Farrell*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from ***gus graf*** to ***Council Member Mike Bonin*** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **gus graf** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Criss Draper** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Andy Patel** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Laurie Dew** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kiran Patel** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrah** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrah** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrah** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *libby zarrahy* to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrah** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *libby zarrah* to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrah** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **libby zarrah** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrah** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *libby zarrahy* to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrah** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrah** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrah** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrah** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **libby zarrahy** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **David Hersch** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Michelle Steiner** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Peter Kolla** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Scott Mills** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Marko** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita to Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita to Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita to Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita to Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Dean Yamashita** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **shashi poudyal** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt to Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Kara Bartelt** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *javier cano* to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *javier cano* to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *javier cano* to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *javier cano* to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **javier cano** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Amy Ram** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **John Patel** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mike patel** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **David Hersch** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 15, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *irit winter* to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Benjamin Hausler** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinnam** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinnam** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Jeff Zarrinam** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Richard Glenn** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Liz Sheldon** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Alicia Hawkins** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **AJ Patel** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Nash Shah** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Fred DeSota** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Damien Hirsch** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *john beccaria* to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *john beccaria* to *David Hersch* on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *john beccaria* to *Jenny Chavez* on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *john beccaria* to *Hannah Lee* on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *john beccaria* to *Lisa Hansen* on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *john beccaria* to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from *john beccaria* to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *john beccaria* to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *john beccaria* to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from *john beccaria* to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from *john beccaria* to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **john beccaria** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **David Hersch** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 16, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 16, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We therefore ask that the council let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mercedes Simonian** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on
Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Surashbhai Patel** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Beccaria** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022

--

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member Herb Wesson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member Gilbert Cedillo** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Marisa Alcaraz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Liz Saldivar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **David Hersch** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Dennis Gleason** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Jenny Chavez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Jeanne Min** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Hannah Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Chad Molnar** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Rachel Brashier** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Solomon Rivera** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Ackley Padilla** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Lisa Hansen** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Karo Torossian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Matt Hale** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Debby Kim** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Jennifer Barraza** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Andrea Conant** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis to Council Member Curren Price** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member Joe Buscaino** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member Monica Rodriguez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member Kevin de Leon** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member Nithya Raman** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member John Lee** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member Paul Krekorian** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis to Council Member Marqueece Harris-Dawson** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member Paul Koretz** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis to Council Member Mitch O'Farrell** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member Mike Bonin** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member Nury Martinez** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.

-- Sent from **Mark Davis** to **Council Member Bob Blumenfield** on Jun 14, 2022 --

Dear [@legislatorTitle] [@legislatorLast],

Dear City Council Members:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the "Workplace Security, Workload, Wage, and Retention Measures for Hotel Workers" ordinance.

We all want to protect hotel employee; in fact, we support the employee safety elements of the proposal, including panic buttons. However, this ordinance includes many other elements that are unworkable. We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot.

We oppose the measure for the following reasons:

This measure increases water consumption during an unprecedented drought: Angelenos have been asked to reduce their water consumption by 35 percent in light of severe drought conditions. This measure deeply undermines this goal. Mandatory daily room cleaning would increase the use of water, as well as electricity and gas in perpetuity. It also would impose daily room cleaning on guests who prefer to opt out for environmental or other reasons.

This measure would prevent employees from earning additional income: We believe one job should be enough. In cities where square-footage limits have been mandated, employees lose hours as hotels comply with the law, forcing employees to seek additional work elsewhere. At a time where hotels are struggling to fully staff our operations, this would result in further staff shortages, reduced rooms available for guests, and will triple the cost of housekeeping for many small "mom and pop" businesses -- making hotels in Los Angeles less competitive and less affordable for the average family.

This measure would reduce the City's vital TOT revenue: The City has not conducted an economic analysis of how the measure would reduce Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue to the City's General Fund. An ordinance with this much economic constraint has not been proposed in any other city. Los Angeles's hospitality jobs and economy are struggling to recover from the pandemic, and this ordinance will hurt the industry's ability to rebound and reduce TOT revenue that fund critical city services.

Despite its stated goal of protecting employees, this measure is deeply harmful to our employees, to the hotel industry, and ultimately, to the entire City.

We, therefore, ask that the council to let the voters decide - Send it to the ballot. If members are not willing to do so, we encourage the council to referend this measure to the voters. Thank you for your consideration.